

February 3, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 679

men who are serving and have served in Southeast Asia.

So, it is a very challenging job. This bill which has been given very careful thought is designed to provide the money and the means for the research programs through which it is hoped that something better than methadone or better than the other treatments that we are now employing as counteraction drugs can be found and the bill is designed for treatment and rehabilitation programs that will reach into every community in America in order to give them an opportunity to try to do something for these people who have fallen victim to heroin addiction.

Mr. SPEAKER, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER, in conclusion I hope that this rule will be adopted in order that this important legislation may be considered by the House.

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statements just made by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER). This resolution calls for an open rule with 1 hour of debate. The purpose of H.R. 12089 is to bring about the most effective deployment of Federal resources against the growth of drug abuse in the United States by providing for the creation of a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention under a Director having broad powers over the conduct of drug abuse treatment, rehabilitation, education, and research programs and activities throughout the Federal Government. In his message of June 17, 1971, the President called for the establishment of such an office, and while H.R. 12089 confers less sweeping powers on the Director than would the original administration proposal, he nevertheless is given substantial authority.

Although policymaking powers of the Director extend only to the so-called demand side of the drug abuse problem, the bill makes clear that in the exercise of his responsibilities he is to maintain communication and liaison with governmental officials concerned with the "supply side," that is, illicit trafficking both domestic and foreign.

The bill also amends the Community Mental Health Centers Act and the Public Health Service Act to assure that there is recognition of the drug problem in the conduct of programs carried out under those acts, and additional appropriations are authorized for planning and evaluation and for the support of special projects in areas where the need is greatest.

Cost: This bill will authorize \$12,000,000 for fiscal 1972, \$171,000,000 for fiscal year 1973, and \$228,000,000 for fiscal year 1974.

The major amendment added by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce provides:

The establishment of the Office in the Executive Office of the President shall not be construed as affecting access by the Congress

or committees of either House (1) to information, documents, and studies in the possession of or conducted by the Office, or (2) to personnel of the Office.

Mr. SPEAKER, there may be some amendments necessary to page 13, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), has already indicated.

Mr. SPEAKER, I would like to point out to the House that the President has recognized the need for this legislation and in his message on June 17 to this Congress he requested it. The next day, on June 18, 1971, the legislation was introduced, and here we are on February 3, 1972, just debating it on the floor of the House. In my humble judgment, Mr. SPEAKER, with the crisis we are facing in this Nation in the area of drug abuse it is high time that this Congress acts and that it act today without further delay, and I hope we can pass this rule and eliminate some of the objections that might be raised to the bill and get the bill passed because, as I say, I think the country needs it and it needs it now.

Mr. SPEAKER, I have no requests for time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

February 3, 1972.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with a great deal of regret that I must ask you to accept my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

For some time there has been a conflict in duties between my two Committees and the situation has recently become more strained by my assignment to the Research and Development Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services. I have attempted to give full and good service on both my Committees and when I began to feel that one duty might suffer because of the other, I reached the decision that in all good conscience I would have to relinquish my assignment to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I have greatly enjoyed my service on this Committee and am very sorry that it must come to an end. It is requested that my service with this Committee be terminated as of February 3, 1972.

Sincerely,

C. W. BILL YOUNG,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.
There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this, on last Thursday several bills which I had been working on for months, but had not yet introduced, were dropped in the hopper with the names of Members on them who had no knowledge of the contents of the bills or that they were sponsoring the legislation. The bills dealt with the improvement of firefighting and the reduction of the casualties of fire in America. I believe this incident points out a serious hole in the House's procedures which could work to the detriment of all Members of the House. I believe it is essential that we take immediate steps to correct this situation. My inquiry is whether steps are being taken to prevent such a recurrence for the protection of all of us.

The SPEAKER. In response to the inquiry made by the gentleman from Connecticut, the Chair desires to make a statement concerning the introduction of bills.

It has come to the attention of the Chair that several bills have been introduced recently in the names of Members who have no knowledge of or responsibility for their introduction.

Rule XXII of the rules of this House makes it clear that Members, and Members alone, have the right to introduce bills—that is, to cause them to be placed in the hopper here at the Clerk's desk. When a bill is found in the hopper, it has been assumed to be authentic.

The Chair has observed, and knows it has become common practice, that Members' offices often send bills to the floor by messenger or page and ask that they be dropped in the hopper by a page or a doorman. The pages and doormen, of course, have no way of knowing the authenticity of bills which they receive by messenger or otherwise.

It would seem to the Chair that it would be a much safer practice if Members, in addition to having their names typed or printed on the bills, would also affix their signatures thereon. Members would also be protecting their own interests if they would personally place their bills in the hopper.

The Chair feels that the right to introduce legislation is one of the most important and fundamental rights of the Members of this House. It should not be a slipshod or casual practice. In the interest of safeguarding the integrity of this process, and to protect Members against future instances where bills are introduced without their authorization, the Chair is issuing instructions that the pages, their overseers, and other employees in the Chamber shall have no authority to place any bill, memorial, petition, or other material in the hopper unless it bears the original signature of a Member thereon. In the case of a bill or resolution which is jointly sponsored, the signature must be that of the Member first named thereon. The bill clerk is instructed to return to the Member any bill which appears in the hopper without an original signature of the Member.

Finally, the Chair suggests that the Clerk of the House notify all Members of this statement so that they will be aware of this new policy and procedure for the introduction of legislation.

SPECIAL ACTION OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12089) to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12089, with Mr. FRASER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, you heard the two members of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI) explain the bill and say that it was a very important bill. In fact, both of them agreed that it may be one of the most important bills being considered by this session of the Congress. This is a bill affecting human beings and the health of the land.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) and the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN) and all the members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and the Environment for the lengthy hearings that they had on the bill. They held hearings for 20 days and took 4 days for the markup. They heard 110 witnesses. So you know the bill was not just summarily put together and brought to this House in a hasty fashion.

When you hold 20 days of hearings and hear 110 witnesses, you know a lot of time has been put in working on the bill. So I would like to compliment the subcommittee for all the work they have done. I think they have done an excellent job.

The bill came out of the subcommittee unanimously. It came out of the full committee unanimously. A similar bill has been passed by the other body and it was passed unanimously.

The bill which came out of the Senate authorized an appropriation of approximately \$1,800,000,000. The House bill which we are now considering authorizes \$411,000,000 over 3 years, and is one that will do the job. It will bring the many different agencies handling this matter together.

As was stated by the two gentlemen who appeared for the Rules Committee,

one of the purposes of the bill is to combat crime in this country and to prevent the degradation of the human being. An example of such degradation was depicted in a picture in a magazine the other day. It showed a boy hanging on a rope, and the statement accompanying the picture was, "This is the kick that most of these boys get." We know our young people are really hanging themselves when they get hooked on the different drugs. That is what we are trying to prevent, and where prevention fails, we hope to provide a cure.

We are trying to combat drug abuse not only by prosecuting those who manufacture drugs, and those who peddle and sell them, but also through research into blocking agents, and through treatment and education, and helping those who have been addicted, in an attempt to keep youngsters and older people from getting hooked on drugs.

I think it is essential now that the Congress have the vision to look ahead and do something about this problem.

We have provided for a combined approach by all of the agencies that have anything to do with drug research, rehabilitation, correction, treatment, and so forth. We wanted to bring them all up to date and to provide that they have a unified approach so that they might have the best program that could be devised. If we would leave one agency out, we know we would have a weakness in the chain. So we have taken in every one of them and have said, "We want to make the program strong, as strong as we possibly can, by placing them under the umbrella." That is the reason for several of the agencies being brought into the scope of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill incorporates recommendations made by the administration to provide for the establishment of a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention in the Executive Office of the President. The principal purpose of this Office is stated in section 221(a) of the bill, which states that—

The Director shall provide overall planning and policy and establish objectives and priorities for all federal drug abuse prevention functions.

The term "drug abuse prevention functions" means any program or activity relating to drug abuse training, treatment, rehabilitation, or research.

There are a number of Federal programs dealing with the overall subject of education, training, treatment, rehabilitation, and research in the field of drug abuse. These programs are carried out by a variety of agencies, whose roles and missions differ. This means, as a practical matter, that the programs of these agencies are not necessarily consistent with each other as they relate to drug abuse prevention. Among the programs and activities of the Federal Government in this field are the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, which is administered by the Department of Justice, as well as the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. The Department of Labor has a drug abuse program under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. The National Institute of Mental Health conducts a number of programs relating to

drug abuse, both under the Public Health Service Act and the Community Mental Health Centers Act. The Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare administers the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970. The Office of Economic Opportunity has programs in this field, and two of the largest programs in the Federal Government are run, respectively, by the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration.

The function of the Director of the Special Action Office will be to see that all these various programs are carried out in a consistent manner.

The Director is given the same authority over projects and expenditures in the field of drug abuse prevention as is presently exercised by the Office of Management and Budget, but the bill specifically prohibits the Director from waiving or disregarding any limitation or requirement prescribed by law with respect to any Federal program or activity. The administration proposed even more far-reaching authority which the committee was unwilling to provide, under which the Director could have transferred funds from one agency to another. We have limited the Director's authority to grant him the same, but no more, authority as is exercised by OMB.

Some concern was expressed that the Director, in exercising his authority under this bill, might limit or restrict other agencies from carrying out their primary mission. For that reason, the bill was amended to make it clear that the Director's authority is limited to the conduct of drug abuse prevention functions, and does not extend to other programs or activities of the Department of Defense or the Veterans' Administration.

The bill is a 3-year bill, with the authority of the Director terminating June 30, 1974. The Special Action Office is authorized appropriations totaling \$200 million, for the purpose of establishing new programs of drug abuse prevention, research into drugs for treatment of drug abuse, and for training.

In addition, another \$211 million in new funds is authorized for programs under the Community Mental Health Centers Act, and for grants to the states for planning and evaluation of more effective drug abuse prevention programs.

The bill is designed to insure that, in the field of drug abuse prevention, the Federal Government will begin to speak with one voice, instead of a multitude. We feel that this bill will make a significant contribution to more effectively meet the problem of drug abuse in the Nation, and I think the bill should pass the House unanimously.

If there are any questions about the bill, I shall be glad to answer them, or I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. PAUL ROGERS, or Mr. NELSEN, the ranking member on the other side, would be glad to answer any questions at all.

The bill is one should have been passed a few years ago. The time is now late. The time has come when we must pass this bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.